

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re New Patent Application of	)
Yuichi KUBO et al.	) Group Art Unit 1725
Application No. 10/663,726	) Examiner Samuel M. Heinrich
Filing Date: September 17, 2003	) Confirmation No. 2222
For: DIE BONDER	)

**REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL OFFICE ACTION**

Mail Stop: AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

A final Office Action was mailed on May 4, 2007, in connection with the above-captioned patent application in response to applicants' Amendment of February 1, 2007, which failed to address the major points of argument presented by applicants in the remarks forming part of that Amendment. As set forth in MPEP § 706.07:

In making the final rejection, ***all outstanding grounds of rejection*** of record should be carefully reviewed, and any such grounds relied on in the final rejection should be reiterated. They ***must also be clearly developed to such an extent that applicant may readily judge the advisability of an appeal*** unless a single previous Office action contains a complete statement supporting the rejection.

However, where a single previous Office action contains a complete statement of a ground of rejection, ***the final rejection*** may refer to such a statement and also ***should include a rebuttal of any arguments raised in the applicant's reply.***


The Examiner's final rejection clearly does not comply with these procedural mandates since the final Office Action does not address applicants' argument that the Brown and Fujimoto et al. patents constitute nonanalogous prior art which cannot properly be relied upon (paragraph spanning pages 5 and 6 of applicants' reply) nor does it address applicants' arguments in the first full paragraph of page 6 as to why the Brown and Fujimoto et al. patents would not make

it obvious to provide the claimed feature that is quoted in that paragraph in the devices of the Japanese references.

As a result of the Examiner's failure to comply with the dictates of the MPEP, his position is not clearly developed to such an extent that applicants can readily judge the advisability of an appeal. Therefore, the Examiner is requested to issue a Supplemental Office Action in which he specifically addresses applicants' positions referred to above.

Furthermore, since this request is being made within one month from issuance of the Office Action, the period for response is requested to be reset as of the date of mailing of the requested Supplemental Office Action as provided for in MPEP § 707.06.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
David S. Safran  
Registration No. 27,997

Customer No. 25570

Roberts Mlotkowski & Hobbes P.C.  
P.O. Box 10064  
McLean, VA 22102

Direct Telephone: (703) 584-3273

DSS:kmm